



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,616	03/18/2004	Jonathan Barsade	BAR-6	5894
24039	7590	02/25/2009	EXAMINER	
INNOVAR, LLC			ERB, NATHAN	
P O BOX 250647			ART UNIT	
PLANO, TX 75025			PAPER NUMBER	
			3628	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			02/25/2009	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/803,616

**Applicant(s)**

BARSADE ET AL.

**Examiner**

NATHAN ERB

**Art Unit**

3628

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NATHAN ERB, Examiner.(3) RICK MATOS, Agent.(2) JOHN HAYES, SPE.(4) JONATHAN BARSADE, Applicant.

Date of Interview: 23 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 18, and 21-23.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sullivan and Agee et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The rejection of claim 1 was discussed extensively. Agent and Applicant pointed out what features they believe distinguish Applicant's invention from the prior art. Examiner Erb pointed out portions of the cited references that he believed were relevant to Applicant's arguments. SPE Hayes discussed some of the specific phrasing of claim 1. Claims 18 and 21-23 were also discussed, as well as the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/NATHAN ERB/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3628

/John W Hayes/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628